

Georgia Southern University Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Index

Faculty Senate Documents

9-23-2010

Notes from Ad Hoc Task Force on Faculty Governance Meeting

Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Georgia Southern University, "Notes from Ad Hoc Task Force on Faculty Governance Meeting" (2010). *Faculty Senate Index*. 586.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/586>

This other is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Notes for Ad Hoc Task Force on Faculty Governance Meeting of 9-23-10

Attending: Ken Clark, Henry Eisenhart, Robert Vogel, Ron McKinnon, Mark Welford, Pat Walker, Michael Moore, Richard Flynn, Tom Case, Fred Smith.

Observations shared and questions raised during the course of the meeting:

Some colleges' promotion and tenure policy and procedure are contained in their bylaws. Is there an advantage to doing it that way?

JPHCPH will probably be redoing their policies soon, on the advice of a recent accreditation team visit.

The COST representative reported that a new requirement that all tenure-line faculty must apply for external grants as a requirement for promotion and tenure is not appropriate for every department in the college. Nevertheless, he reported, after the whole college faculty voted against this requirement, a second voting method was tried, this time department by department, and it passed.

With the heavy emphasis on grants in the current climate, there is a fear that in time a faculty member's annual review will mostly be focused on how much grant money he/she brings in, at least in some colleges.

The President was quite clear in the forums that the criteria for promotion and tenure should be established at the departmental level. Procedures might be college wide, but only the department is familiar enough with the expectations of the discipline to decide on the criteria.

The creative arts are a particularly good example, since few outside those areas have a sense of what the norms for the disciplines consist of.

Some colleges already have separate criteria residing in departments (CLASS and COE), while some do not (COBA, CIT, CHHS, JPHCPH).

Some colleges are quite content with having college wide criteria. Some colleges are also satisfied with the level of faculty involvement in the designing of their policy and procedures, while some are not.

The problem of top down establishment of promotion and tenure requirements is a very old problem.

Some colleges (COE, CLASS and CIT have a small body of elected faculty who serve as advisory boards to the dean. These boards operate in different models, some of them initiate policy while others are merely sounding boards for the dean.

We discussed President Keel's statement that new faculty are to exceed "the departmental mean plus one." The committee asked what this means. Is this only concerned with scholarship, or is it the faculty member's total value to the department, including teaching proficiency, course loads taught, service to the department, service to the University, service to the discipline, as well as scholarship?

The committee clarified its charge. We decided that we must proceed to tackle manageable tasks. We decided initially to:

1. Draft a "best practices" for the establishment of promotion and tenure policies and procedures. These policies and procedures will include faculty involvement in their drafting and faculty approval of the end product. Also, they will clearly state that the evaluation criteria are to be established at the departmental level.
2. Recommend that all colleges establish a faculty advisory body such as the ones in COE and CIT.

[Potential issue: how to insist on the establishment of departmental criteria when some colleges are perfectly satisfied with college-wide criteria.]

For next meeting: Task Force members will describe the writing and approval process of their tenure and promotion policies and procedures beginning with the ones in force before the current ones. Members of the committee are encouraged to post these reports in the shared documents space of our sharepoint site:

<https://sharepoint.georgiasouthern.edu/President/facultysenate/Faculty%20Governance/Shared%20Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx>

Members of the committee who are also AAUP members will search their materials for recommended governance policies and share with the Task Force.

The Task Force will meet again on Thursday, Oct. 7, 4pm, COE Dean's Conference Room.